

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been examined. Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 14, 19, and 20 have been amended. Claim 18 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 5, 8, 18, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite “communication network” rather than “computer network.” Claim 8 has been amended to recite “a second redemption category” as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 18 has been canceled. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 14; claim 14 has been amended to include proper antecedent basis. In light of the amendments, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chien. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that “the redemption amount is of a same unit of measurement as the elective balance.” Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at paragraph 39, lines 4-5 of the original Application. As shown in an embodiment in Fig. 3 of the original Application, Employee G’s elective balance is all allocated to category D. All of the elective balance of 600 is multiplied by a bid premium of 121% to result in a redemption amount of 726. Meanwhile, the amounts 600 and 726 have a same unit of measurement. In contrast, Chien appears to describe converting loyalty points to dollar amounts (Chien, paragraph 52), which are of different units of measurement.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to clarify “receiving a percentage number, wherein the percentage number represents a percentage of an elective balance via the second interface.” Claim 10 has been amended with a similar clarification. It is true that Chien does

describe receiving an amount of purchase 55 in Fig. 6. However, it is respectfully submitted that Chien fails to teach receiving a percentage number via an interface.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to incorporate aspects of Claim 18. Claim 18 has been canceled accordingly. Claim 14 has been further amended to clarify that “the bid premium interface comprises bid premiums of a plurality of redemption categories.” Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in Fig. 4 and paragraph 0044 of the original Application. Accordingly, some embodiments might allow one retailer to see offerings by other retailers, thus providing an auction like market for capturing balances associated with elective accounts. While Chien does describe adjusting conversion ratios (Chien, paragraph 0013), Applicants respectfully submit that Chien fails to teach every element of Claim 14 as amended.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Yu-An Kuo/

Yu-An Kuo
Reg. No. 57,669

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
AYK/klb
61358815 v1